## **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR 1.8a)**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being transmitted therewith) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Date May 5, 1999

(Signature)

PATENT APPLICATION

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application

Binggeli et al.

Group: 1613

Serial No. 08/711,339, filed September 6, 1996

Examiner: R. Ramseur

For: NOVEL PIPERIDINE DERIVATIVES HAVING RENIN INHIBITING ACTIVITY

## COMMUNICATION

Nutley, New Jersey 07110 May 5, 1999

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This Communication is filed in response to the March 8, 1999 Office Action issued in connection with the above-identified patent application. A response to this Office Action is due May 8, 1999.

Serial No. 08/711,339

Filed: September 6, 1996

Page -2-

This application is currently under appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and

Interferences ("Board" - a brief was filed February 22, 1999) and is the subject of a

Renewed Petition to Commissioner Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.144 (a petition was filed March

29, 1999).

Claims 1-40 and 42-137 are pending in the subject application. Portions of claims

1-17, 20, 32, 33, 35-39, 42-45, 47, 68-72, 74, 77, 87-90, and all of claims 18, 19, 21-31,

34, 46, 48-67, 73, 75, 76, 79-86, and 91-136, have been withdrawn from further

consideration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b) because they allegedly are drawn to non-

elected inventions. Claims 40, 78, and 137 have been objected to as being dependent

upon a non-allowed claim. The Patent Office has not rejected any claim per se.

However, it is applicants' position that the Patent Office has in fact rejected all of the

pending claims as a result of an improper restriction requirement. Future handling of this

matter is now under consideration by the Board and the Group Director.

The Office Action states "the petition being denied, applicant should limit the

claims to the subject matter indicated as being examined." The obligation of Applicants to

amend claims to accomplish such limitation is the basis for the pending appeal and

petition. Until the Board and the Group Director make a determination, it is applicants'

position that no action is required by applicants.

Serial No. 08/711,339 Filed: September 6, 1996

Page -3-

Applicants have in the past indicated a willingness to consider limiting the

application to a subgenus as defined in a pending claim. To this end, applicants would

consider limiting the pending application to the subgenus as defined in claim 10, if the

Patent Office would examine claim 10 in its entirety on the merits. This subgenus

includes the species of claim 137, which was elected in a Communication dated July 16,

1998. Applicants would reserve the right to prosecute a further continuing patent

application containing claims the remaining subject matter of the application. If such

proposal is not acceptable to the Patent Office, applicants will await the decisions of the

Board and the Group Director.

No fee is required in connection with the filing of this Communication. If any fee is

deemed necessary, authorization is hereby given to charge the amount of any such fee to

Deposit Account No. 08-2525.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant(s)

John P. Harise

Reg. No/34,403

349 Kingsland Street

Nutley, New Jersey 07110

(201) 235-6326

/JPP

82351